



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,838	11/19/2001	Aaron A. Goodisman	VAO-001.02	9385

25181 7590 12/20/2005

FOLEY HOAG, LLP
PATENT GROUP, WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST
155 SEAPORT BLVD
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/988,838	GOODISMAN ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination, filed 6 October 2005, to the original application, filed 19 November 2001.
2. Claims 1, 3, and 5-14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1).
3. Claim 2 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) and Kraft (U.S. Patent 6,137,488).
4. Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) and Marcy (U.S. Patent 6,662,342 B1).
5. The rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) has been withdrawn, however, a new grounds of rejection is added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. The rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) and Vanechanos, Jr (U.S. Patent 5,884,309) has been withdrawn, however, a new grounds of rejection is added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. The rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) and Armstrong (U.S. Patent 6,356,633 B1) has been withdrawn, however, a new grounds of rejection is added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) and Marcy (U.S. Patent 6,662,342 B1) has been withdrawn, however, a new grounds of rejection is added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 3, and 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) in further view of Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1).

As per claim 1, Horowitz discloses a method of modifying a document containing at least one object that includes providing at least one object memory (See Horowitz, Column 5, lines 49-56), and creating an association between the object in the document and the object memory based on context data (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 1-5). Horowitz discloses creating an association between the object in the document and the object memory based on context data (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 1-5). Horowitz does not disclose expressly, based on the association, replacing the object in the document with an abbreviated form of the object. Horowitz also does not disclose expressly a local or global configuration. Kudrolli discloses a system and method for replacing text with an abbreviated version. (See Kudrolli, Column 4, lines 1-40, and Column 1, lines 6-17). Kudrolli also discloses control parameters stored either locally or in a wide area network (See Kudrolli, Column 17, lines 25-36, and Figure 2, element 125) in a parameters set file, which defines how a user will interface with the system (See Kudrolli, Column 3, lines 47-55). Additionally, Kudrolli also discloses creating an association between the object in the document, namely the input text of the document,

and the object memory, namely the abbreviation database, through the use of parameters that control the abbreviation function (See Kudrolli, Columns 18-19, Table 2). Kudrolli also discloses that upon initiating access to the document in preparation for use of the document by a user of a device, namely upon activation of the abbreviation function upon an input document, the association created by abbreviation parameters is based on contents of the document, such as length of the text of the document or specific content values, such as personal names contained within the document (See Kudrolli, Column 17, lines 5-10), is based on context data regarding the device, such as the space constraints of the output location, which includes various device types as defined by Kudrolli (See Kudrolli, Column 18, lines 45-47; Column 17, lines 29-36; and Columns 9-11 which define various output locations such as computer screens, Web sites, pagers, newspaper columns, control panels, television screens, billboards, teleprompters, and book publications), and can also be based on context data regarding the characteristics of a user of a device, such as a personal name or title (See Kudrolli, Column 17, lines 5-18). Horowitz and Kudrolli are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the abbreviation method and control parameters of Kudrolli with the association between the document object and object memory of Horowitz. The motivation for doing so would have been to make up for spatial limitations of a display screen. (See Kudrolli, Column 1, lines 12-15) and to define how a user will interface with the system (See Kudrolli, Column 3, lines 47-55). At the time of the invention it would also have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the abbreviation parameters based on the contents of the document and on context data regarding the device and the user of the device of Kudrolli with the method of modifying a document with at least one object of Horowitz. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow abbreviation parameters to be pre-defined to optimize the results of the method, in tune with the language of the text abbreviated, personal preferences, and specific knowledge domain (See Kudrolli, Column 9, lines 30-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kudrolli with Horowitz for the benefit of accommodating a more limited display and defining how a user will interface with the system and for the benefit of allowing abbreviation parameters to be pre-defined to optimize the results of the method, in tune with the language of the text abbreviated, personal preferences, and specific knowledge domain to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per claim 3, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses creating an association based on at least one object, which is included in the possible associations set forth in claim 3. (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 66-67, and Column 8, lines 1-9).

As per claim 5, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses that the object is a word or group of words, which are included in the possible object types set forth in claim 5. (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 59-64).

As per claim 6, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses generating a selectable link. (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 32-38).

As per claim 7, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses providing at least one association feature including an anchor link, which is one of the possible association features set forth in claim 7. (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 24-31).

As per claim 8, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses creating an association based on linguistic processing of the document, which is one of the possible associations set forth in claim 8. (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 50-67, and Column 9, lines 1-12).

As per claim 9, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses that the document format includes HTML, which is one of the possible formats set forth in claim 9. (See Horowitz, Column 4, lines 1-12).

As per claim 10, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses identifying a link and a pop-up window, which are among the list of possible choices set forth in claim 10. (See Horowitz, Column 7, lines 30-31).

As per claim 11, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses providing at least one application to be

executed upon selection of the association. (See Horowitz, Column 10, lines 64-67, and Column 11, lines 1-2).

As per claim 12, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses executing at least one application. (See Horowitz, Column 10, lines 64-67, and Column 11, lines 1-2).

As per claim 13, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses providing an index, which is among the list of possible choices set forth in claim 13. (See Horowitz, Column 6, lines 45-48).

As per claim 14, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz also discloses providing a protocol that includes Hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), which is among the list of possible protocols set forth in claim 14. (See Horowitz, Column 4, lines 11-12).

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kraft (U.S. Patent 6,137,488).

As per claim 2, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz and Kudrolli do not disclose expressly providing a toggle object in the abbreviated document to convert the object to an unabbreviated version and vice versa. Kraft discloses providing a toggle button to display either a fully-shown form or a shortened form. (See Kraft, Column 12, lines 26-28). Horowitz, Kudrolli and Kraft are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying

information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the toggle button of Kraft with the abbreviated document of Horowitz and Kudrolli. The motivation for doing so would have been to make up for spatial limitations of a display screen. (See Kudrolli, Column 1, lines 12-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kraft with Horowitz and Kudrolli for the benefit of accommodating a more limited display to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

12. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) and Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Marcy (U.S. Patent 6,662,342 B1).

As per claim 4, Horowitz and Kudrolli disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz and Kudrolli do not disclose expressly that creating the association includes creating based on at least one of a time of day, location, user profile, security clearance, job function, job description, document type, document location, application executing on the device or a user identity. Marcy discloses creating an association based on document type. (See Marcy, Column 4, lines 30-67, and Column 5, lines 1-8). Horowitz, Kudrolli and Marcy are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the association based on document type of Marcy with the creation of the association between the document object and the object(s) in memory of Horowitz and

Kudrolli. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the structure of the document. (See Marcy, Column 4, lines 30-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Marcy with Horowitz and Kudrolli for the benefit of defining the document structure to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

13. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) in further view of Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) and Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717).

As per claim 15, Horowitz discloses a method of modifying a document containing at least one object that includes providing at least one object memory (See Horowitz, Column 5, lines 49-56), and creating an association between the object in the document and the object memory based on context data (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 1-5). Horowitz discloses creating an association between the object in the document and the object memory based on context data (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 1-5). Horowitz also discloses inserting a tag in the document. (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 5-9). Horowitz does not disclose expressly, based on the association, replacing the object in the document with an abbreviated form of the object. Horowitz also does not disclose expressly that the tag is a pre-configured response. Horowitz also does not disclose expressly a local or global configuration. Kudrolli discloses a system and method for replacing text with an abbreviated version. (See Kudrolli, Column 4, lines 1-40, and Column 1, lines 6-17). Kudrolli also discloses control parameters stored either locally or in a wide area network (See Kudrolli, Column 17,

lines 25-36, and Figure 2, element 125) in a parameters set file, which defines how a user will interface with the system (See Kudrolli, Column 3, lines 47-55). Additionally, Kudrolli also discloses creating an association between the object in the document, namely the input text of the document, and the object memory, namely the abbreviation database, through the use of parameters that control the abbreviation function (See Kudrolli, Columns 18-19, Table 2). Kudrolli also discloses that upon initiating access to the document in preparation for use of the document by a user of a device, namely upon activation of the abbreviation function upon an input document, the association created by abbreviation parameters is based on contents of the document, such as length of the text of the document or specific content values, such as personal names contained within the document (See Kudrolli, Column 17, lines 5-10), is based on context data regarding the device, such as the space constraints of the output location, which includes various device types as defined by Kudrolli (See Kudrolli, Column 18, lines 45-47; Column 17, lines 29-36; and Columns 9-11 which define various output locations such as computer screens, Web sties, pagers, newspaper columns, control panels, television screens, billboards, teleprompters, and book publications), and can also be based on context data regarding the characteristics of a user of a device, such as a personal name or title (See Kudrolli, Column 17, lines 5-18). Reed discloses the use of a pre-configured response or standard answer (See Reed, Column 75, lines 10-15). Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the

Art Unit: 2176

abbreviation method and control parameters of Kudrolli with the association between the document object and object memory of Horowitz. The motivation for doing so would have been to make up for spatial limitations of a display screen. (See Kudrolli, Column 1, lines 12-15) and to define how a user will interface with the system (See Kudrolli, Column 3, lines 47-55). At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the abbreviation parameters based on the contents of the document and on context data regarding the device and the user of the device of Kudrolli with the method of modifying a document with at least one object of Horowitz. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow abbreviation parameters to be pre-defined to optimize the results of the method, in tune with the language of the text abbreviated, personal preferences, and specific knowledge domain (See Kudrolli, Column 9, lines 30-37). The motivation for doing so would have been to organize information in a form that simplifies transfer of data (See Reed, Column 8, lines 52-54) and to allow the user to edit operational preferences (See Reed, Column 70, lines 25-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kudrolli with Horowitz for the benefit of accommodating a more limited display and defining how a user will interface with the system and for the benefit of allowing abbreviation parameters to be pre-defined to optimize the results of the method, in tune with the language of the text abbreviated, personal preferences, and specific knowledge domain to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the preconfigured response of Reed with the object of Horowitz and Kudrolli. The

motivation for doing so would have been to organize information in a form that simplifies transfer of data (See Reed, Column 8, lines 52-54) and to allow the user to edit operational preferences (See Reed, Column 70, lines 25-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reed with Horowitz and Kudrolli for the benefit of simplifying the data transfer process and allowing the user to edit operational preferences to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

As per claim 16, Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Horowitz also discloses that the pre-configured response is selectable. (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 32-37).

As per claim 17, Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Reed also discloses executing at least one function based on a selection of the pre-configured response. (See Reed, Column 75, lines 14-30). Horowitz and Reed are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the execution of a function of Reed with the preconfigured response object of Horowitz and Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a list of documents or links that the user could select from. (See Reed, Column 75, lines 17-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reed with Horowitz and Reed for the benefit of allowing the user to select among possible documents or links to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

14. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647) Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) and Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Vanechanos, Jr (U.S. Patent 5,884,309).

As per claim 18, Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed do not disclose expressly that the pre-configured response is one of a Yes, No and telephone number. Vanechanos, Jr discloses a user may provide a yes or no answer. (See Vanechanos, Jr, Column 8, lines 3-9). Horowitz, Kudrolli, Reed and Vanechanos, Jr are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the yes or no response of Vanechanos, Jr with the standard answer of Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to organize the information in a form that simplifies transfer of data. (See Reed, Column 8, lines 52-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Vanechanos, Jr with Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed for the benefit of simplifying the data transfer process to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

15. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) and Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Armstrong (U.S. Patent 6,356,633 B1).

As per claim 19, Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed do not disclose expressly communicating the pre-configured response upon selection of the pre-configured response to at least one of a telephone server and an email server. Armstrong discloses the use of an email server and telephone system to send responses to a user. (See Armstrong, Column 9, lines 12-18, and Column 4, lines 55-65). Horowitz, Kudrolli, Reed and Armstrong are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the email server of Armstrong with the pre-configured response of Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to route and track responses to and from a user (See Armstrong, Column 4, lines 2-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Armstrong with Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed for the benefit of routing and tracking responses to and from a user to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

16. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), Kudrolli (U.S. Patent 6,279,018 B1) and Reed (U.S. Patent 6,088,717) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Marcy (U.S. Patent 6,662,342 B1).

As per claim 20, Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed do not disclose expressly that creating the association includes creating based on at least one of a time of day,

Art Unit: 2176

location, user profile, security clearance, job function, job description, document type, document location, application executing on the device or a user identity. Marcy discloses creating an association based on document type. (See Marcy, Column 4, lines 30-67, and Column 5, lines 1-8). Horowitz, Kudrolli, Reed and Marcy are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the association based on document type of Marcy with the creation of the association between the document object and the object(s) in memory of Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the structure of the document. (See Marcy, Column 4, lines 30-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Marcy with Horowitz, Kudrolli and Reed for the benefit of defining the document structure to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed 6 October 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on Pages 7-8 of the Instant Amendment that Horowitz in combination with Kudrolli fails to teach context data. The Office respectfully disagrees. Kudrolli teaches abbreviation parameters that are specific to various values within the

context of the input document, such as the characteristics of a user of a device, including a personal name or title (See Kudrolli, Column 17, lines 5-18).

Applicant argues on Page 8 of the Instant Amendment that Horowitz in combination with Kudrolli fails to teach creating the association upon initiating access to the document in preparation for use of the document. The Office respectfully disagrees. Kudrolli teaches that upon activation of the abbreviation function upon an input document, the association created by abbreviation parameters is based on contents of the document, such as length of the text of the document or specific content values, such as personal names contained within the document (See Kudrolli, Column 17, lines 5-10), is based on context data regarding the device, such as the space constraints of the output location, which includes various device types as defined by Kudrolli (See Kudrolli, Column 18, lines 45-47; Column 17, lines 29-36; and Columns 9-11 which define various output locations such as computer screens, Web sties, pagers, newspaper columns, control panels, television screens, billboards, teleprompters, and book publications), and can also be based on context data regarding the characteristics of a user of a device, such as a personal name or title (See Kudrolli, Column 17, lines 5-18). It is well known that the output locations as taught by Kudrolli are devices that display information to a user. While Kudrolli does not teach expressly that the output document is to be used, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the output document sent to one of the above listed output locations has been processed in preparation for use by a user of the output device.

Applicant argues on Page 9 of the Instant Amendment that Horowitz in combination with Kudrolli fails to teach creating an association between an object of a document and an object memory upon initiating access to the document. The Office respectfully disagrees. Horowitz discloses creating an association between the object in the document and the object memory based on context data (See Horowitz, Column 8, lines 1-5). Additionally, Kudrolli also discloses creating an association between the object in the document, namely the input text of the document, and the object memory, namely the abbreviation database, through the use of parameters that control the abbreviation function (See Kudrolli, Columns 18-19, Table 2).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine Kudrolli with Horowitz would have been to allow abbreviation parameters to be pre-defined to optimize the results of the generation of contextual hyperlinks within a document, in tune with the language of the text abbreviated, personal preferences, and specific knowledge domain (See Kudrolli, Column 9, lines 30-37).

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

19. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12/17/2005